

### REMARKS

New claims 66 and 67 are similar to, and correspond respectively to, pending claims 11 and 57, submitted with Response D filed May 30, 2002, two business days previously. The sole difference between new claims 66 and 67 and pending claims 11 and 57 is that the added claims require muting to be at the post-transcriptional level rather than at both post-transcriptional and transcriptional levels.


Support for pending claims 57-65 can be found in the Application, p. 14, lines 24-27; p. 23 lines 1-4; and p. 30, lines 15-18; and Examples 7-15. Similarly, support for new claims 66 and 67 can be found in the Application, p. 14, lines 24-27; p. 23 lines 1-4; and p. 30, lines 15-18; and Examples 7-15.

Applicant respectfully submits that this Supplemental Response D will not unduly interfere with the preparation of an Office Action responsive to the previous reply, and for this reason it is proper under MPEP §1.111 (a)(2). It is therefore respectfully submitted that Supplemental Response D be entered and the two new claims 66 and 67 be examined. It is further respectfully submitted that new claims 66 and 67 are in condition for allowance. Consideration of the added claims and a notice of allowance are therefore requested.

It is believed that no extension of time is needed; however, this conditional petition for an extension of time is being made in the event that the need for an extension has been overlooked. If any additional fees are required for the timely consideration of this application, please charge deposit account number 19-4972. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if any matters remain outstanding so that they may be resolved expeditiously.

Date: June 3, 2002

Respectfully submitted,



---

Bruce D. Sunstein  
Registration No. 27,234  
Attorney for Applicants  
Bromberg & Sunstein LLP  
125 Summer Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618  
Tel: 617/443-9292  
Fax: 617/443-0004